

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 9 and 11-13 are amended. New claims 14-29 are presented. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 and 10 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 9 and 11-29 are pending and under consideration.

ITEMS 2-8: REJECTION OF CLAIM 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §101 contending that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter and does not include a "distinguishable apparatus, computer implementation, or any other incorporated technology."

Claim 9 is amended herein to recite a service brokering method for providing a complex service integrating a plurality of elementary services realized on "a system which comprises a user agent on a user's computer, a brokering agent connected to the user agent via a network and providing a complex service integrating a plurality of elementary services realized on a computer to the user agent."

Applicant submits that claim 9, as amended, includes a distinguishable apparatus or computer implementation and requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant also respectfully points out to the Examiner that in the precedential decision of *Ex Parte Lundgren*, Appeal 2003--2088 (October 2005), the USPTO Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has ruled "that there is currently no judicially recognized 'technological arts' test to determine patent eligible subject matter under § 101." The Board also specifically indicated that the non-precedential decision of *Ex Parte Bowman* was not a binding decision. For this reason also, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn for lack of a foundation in the law.

ITEMS 10-21: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9 AND 11-13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY DELORME ET AL. (US 5,948,040)

The Examiner rejects claims 9 and 11-13 as being anticipated by DeLorme. The rejection is traversed.

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention. DeLorme does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited in the present application's independent claims

Independent claims 9 and 11-13, all as amended, respectively recite a service brokering

method, a computer readable storage medium, and a service integration system including, using claim 9 as an example, the brokering agent storing for each elementary service, service description information comprising a combination of identification information of an elementary service agent which provides the elementary service, declarative description information on information needed to realize the elementary services, and declarative description information on the processing results of the elementary services, the declarative description information comprising a declarative description and stating what properties an object of description has; the brokering agent, upon receipt of a request message for the complex service from the user agent, decomposing the complex service into the elementary services using the service description information, and generating a service request plan comprising strings of combinations of at least elementary service request information needed to realize the complex service, and identification information of the elementary service agent which provides the elementary service; and the brokering agent requesting elementary services from the plurality of the elementary service agents based on the generated request plan, and compiling the processing results so that the processing results of the complex service are prepared and notified to the requesting user agent."

Applicant submits that DeLorme does not teach, for example, agents, but merely subsystems. DeLorme merely teaches (see, for example, col. 31, lines 8-23 and FIG. 2) a system that includes:

four characteristic Subsystems--at 221, 223, 213 and 217--handle TRIPS user inquiries directed to place, time, topic and transaction decisions, respectively, and therefore correspond also to the discrete relational data sub-structures shown in FIG. 3, respectively, for GEOGRAPHIC, TEMPORAL, TOPICAL, and ACCOUNTING DATA. . . . The TRIPS Interface & Interaction Bus 209 functions to furnish flexible user-directed access to, from and among the four Subsystems at 221, 223, 213 and 217 within TRIPS 203.

That is, a TRIPS 203 and subsystems 221, 223, 213 and 213 are connected via "the TRIPS Interface interaction Bus 209.

The units 221, 223, 213 and 213 are "subsystems," and accordingly, it is understood in the art, that such unit subsystems are called from "TRIPS 203" for their processing as subroutines. Thus, the TRIPS 203 and subsystems process the information written with "procedural description," and cannot process the information written with "declarative description."

In other words, DeLorme cannot process the information written with "declarative description" since DeLorme does not teach "agents." Rather, DeLorme teaches integrated subsystems merely as a single computer system for a user or a computer system which is

specialized to process the travel reservation and use the procedural description," not the "declarative description".

According to aspects of the present invention, elementary service agents are integrated by a brokering agent to provide a complex service by using the information written with "declarative description.". This feature is not taught by DeLorme, and DeLorme cannot send a request plan generated by using the information written with " declarative description".

Further, according to aspects of the present invention, as recited in claim 12, as amended, for example, a system including the user agent, brokering agent and plurality of elementary service agents are connected via a network.

DeLorme does not teach a network. Rather, DeLorme merely teaches that "TRIPS 203" and subsystems are connected via the Bus 209.

According to aspects of the present invention, it is easy for the system to integrate (or extend) a new service to existing complex services by connecting a new agent that provides the new service to the brokering agent via the network.

Since DeLorme does not teach a user agent on a user's computer, a brokering agent on a computer, and a plurality of elementary service agents on its own computer, or the agents on different computer and connected via network, DeLorme does not teach a system readily able to integrate a new service to existing complex services, and instead would possibly require a redesign the system.

Summary

Since features recited by claims 9 and 11-13 are not taught by the cite art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims allowed.

New Claims

New dependent claims recite features of the invention in a different fashion. No new matter is presented. New claims 14-17, 19 and 20 respectively correspond, for example, to claims 3-8 cancelled herein.

It is submitted that claims 14-29 patentably distinguish over the cited art and are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is

requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 12, 2005

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501